REMARKS

Restriction has been imposed between the method and composition claims. In response the applicant elects, with traverse, to prosecute the Group I method claims, claims 1-11 in this application. The claims of the composition group have been marked withdrawn in accord with this election.

The restriction requirement is traversed on the grounds that the inventions are sufficiently related that a proper examination of either invention necessarily involves a search of references pertaining to the other. Therefore, despite technical distinction, it is not an undue burden on the US patent office to examine the inventions of the two groups together.

Further it is submitted that different classification is not evidence of separate status in the art. The USPTO classification system is not the art. Proper evidence of separate status *in the art* would be a showing that documents describing compositions will often fail to also describe its use and that documents describing treatments will often fail to provide the details of the composition employed. Obviously this is not the case in this art. Composition information is provided in method descriptions and use information is provided with composition descriptions. Therefore acquired separate status *in the art* is not a proper justification for the restriction requirement in this case.

For the foregoing reasons reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS

Date: June 16, 2006

By: _____
Walter J. Steinkraus
Registration No.: 29592

6109 Blue Circle Drive, Suite 2000
Minnetonka, MN 55343-9185
Telephone: (952) 563-3000
Facsimile: (952) 563-3001

f:\wpwork\wjs\11334us01_rsp_20060616.doc